

Attention: Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

I am writing this letter of non-support regarding House File 4787 as a private citizen and business owner in the City of Crosby, MN, but for full transparency I acknowledge my role as Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) for the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area (CCSRA) which leads to a greater understanding of the parcel of land for which the legislation has been written, and for whom it's intended to benefit.

I am familiar with the beneficiary of the proposed legislation, Tim Prinsen, and his proposed commercial project on the property in question if he successfully completes his purchase agreement for the property from its current owner.

Despite the fact that the Master Plan for the CCSRA calls for no commercial enterprises within the CCSRA, my concern with the bill, as written, isn't necessarily with the commercial nature of their proposed project. Instead, my concern is what the CCSRA might be giving up due to this legislation, and for the precedent it sets.

This bill ignores three main areas of "protection" that the Prinsens had offered the DNR in negotiations for an easement to the property. Here are my concerns:

1) HR 4787 does not contain covenants that Off Road Vehicles would be prohibited on the property throughout their ownership of the property as well as any subsequent owners (motorized vehicles are prohibited off road within the CCSRA);

2) While the bill offers easement through DNR-controlled land to the property in question, it does *not* restore easement for the current mountain bike trail system that has been forced to close in the disputed area during a breakdown of negotiations with the DNR. This trail closure also affects other user groups, include SCUBA diving and other silent sports.

3) If the Prinsens are successful at purchasing the property, they had offered to "give" their 1/24ths undivided interest in one parcel to the DNR in return for an easement to the back segment of the property which has no undivided interests. The bill, as written, does not call for the transfer of the undivided interest parcel to the DNR.

Besides these three main issues, I feel that this legislative action sets an unfortunate precedent that undermines the DNR and the DNR's Commissioner, in essence acting as a guide for other individuals who want to chip away at public lands controlled by the state. This concern isn't rhetorical or theoretical; in fact, within the boundary of the CCSRA, there continue to be multiple parcels of land with undivided interests. Any landowner could point to this legislation as precedent for obtaining easements to their own parcels through legislative action, rather than following established process and

procedure with the DNR. Under this scenario, it's also possible that future private projects could run contrary to the stated goals of the CCSRA and the silent sports nature it's known (and celebrated) for.

I urge a vote against this legislation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'PK' followed by a long horizontal stroke and a vertical line at the end.

Paul Kirkman
5951 N Bass Lake Dr NE
Remer MN 56672

Amy Zipko

From: Brady Martin <bradymartin27@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 7:44 PM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

This bill effectively forces the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for the benefit of a private parcel. It removes the DNR's ability to follow its standard review process and does not clearly require environmental review or alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

That should concern everyone.

The DNR exists to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource protection through a structured and transparent process. This bill sidesteps that entirely and replaces it with a predetermined outcome. That is not how public land decisions should be made.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership is already complex. Setting a precedent where access is granted through legislative mandate rather than proper review opens the door to future requests being handled the same way. Over time, that chips away at consistent management and undermines the integrity of the system.

More broadly, this is not just about one easement. It is about whether public lands in Minnesota will continue to be managed through established, science-based processes—or whether those processes can be bypassed when convenient. That has real implications for recreation, conservation, and long-term access across the state.

If access is warranted, it should go through the normal DNR review channels like any other request. That process exists for a reason.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support maintaining the DNR's authority and established review processes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Brady Martin

Shoreview, MN

Amy Zipko

From: Tyler Abfalter <tylerabfalter@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:07 PM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

This easement issue is ruining the immaculate design of the best trail system in Minnesota. The Cuyuna mountain bike trails are extremely special to me. I Ride up there, race up there, and bring my kids up there. It's where I developed my love for mountain biking, and it has truly changed my life. This is the impact These trails can have to one person. It's transformed the town too and serves as a model for other Iron Range cities

I hope you make the right decision and allow the easement so The Galloping Goose Trail can flow as it was designed. I can't say how much this one little section being lost affects the entire trail system as Galloping Goose is the connector trail that gets you access to everything else in that unit.

Fun fact, the Galloping Goose Trail is named after the daily train that would run from Crosby to Duluth during the iron mining era. How cool is that? Don't ruin it.

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support

continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Tyler Abfalter
St. Augusta, MN

Amy Zipko

From: Michael Lahm <michael.lahm.302@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:43 PM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to oppose the way the bill seems to be forcing easement and how the couple/LLC is closing access to roads that allow recreational access for 1,000s of people.

The combative actions of a couple people for their own gain are negatively impacting the quality of life of an entire community. They seem to have no regard for the good of the community.

Thank you,
Mike

Amy Zipko

From: Taylor Jessen <tayjessen@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:58 PM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

The way in which they are requesting an easement is negatively impacting a whole community and will set a precedent for the future. When you buy land, you need to be knowledgeable of the restrictions and follow the rules. Public recreation lands depend on consistent science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

I respectfully request you oppose the HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written and support continued DNR led review and established planning process for state-managed recreation land.

Thank you,
Taylor Jessen

Amy Zipko

From: Taylor Jessen <tayjjessen@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:58 PM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

The way in which they are requesting an easement is negatively impacting a whole community and will set a precedent for the future. When you buy land, you need to be knowledgeable of the restrictions and follow the rules. Public recreation lands depend on consistent science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

I respectfully request you oppose the HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written and support continued DNR led review and established planning process for state-managed recreation land.

Thank you,
Taylor Jessen

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy,
I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Andrew Toftness



Amy Zipko

From: Tim Sink <timsink@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:53 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Vote yes Hf4787 and sf5068

Please vote YES on this as everyone has a right to access and use their property, not just the bike people it is not their own private little play area built with public tax dollars, bike people also need to start getting licenses to use these rec areas.

Sent from my iPad

Amy Zipko

From: Paul Ballman <pgball333@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 6:07 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear members of the committee

Please oppose these two bills as it erodes the broad impact of citizens to use MN parks, primarily Cuyuna MTB trails. A few landowners should not have the ability to close huge swaths of MN parks thereby effecting the lively hood of entire regions.

Paul Ballman
Sent from my iPad

Amy Zipko

From: Jeff Helget <jwhelget@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 6:45 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

All future easement use would create traffic in an area where bikes travel. Bikes dodging cars where there should be few. Will they then require the state to put in a bike lane because it's a danger to their quests? Think about the construction of how to get a well rig or cement trucks in. When will they be asking for more improved access, widen roads, trim trees, more disturbance. All for one person's increased wealth on the backs of all. Once given no turning back. 1/24 holding the entire area hostage, please. Just move the road a little. That could happen in a few weeks. Erase the mistake easily.

How do you ignore the fact someone bought property land locked with the goal of just planning on leveraging an easement later.

Allowing a single family residence would be the only remote consideration and even then would have to have heavy stipulations considering all mentioned.

Not sure where anyone found local support. I have not heard it yet.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jeff Helget
Ironton, MN

--

Jeff Helget
96 Viola Ave
PO Box 515
Ironton, MN 56455
320.760.1964

Amy Zipko

From: Claire Finstad <claire81298@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:29 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

My family and I have enjoyed kayaking in this area long before it was a state recreational area. We enjoy family time here weekly, as this particular area we use to access our favorite kayaking spot- Huntington mine Pit. Since becoming a state recreation area, the Cuyuna mine pits have been overrun with out of town folks who leave garbage, park where ever they want, and do not share the space. I worry that with allowing this to move forward, we further open the doors for this place to be destroyed by people who don't appreciate its value. Please consider voting No!

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Claire Finstad

Amy Zipko

From: Scott Rockvam <scottrockvam@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 9:10 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

As a full-time resident of Crosby, and as an outdoor recreationalist, this bill is very concerning to me. For over a decade, the mountain bike trails have been a draw to people throughout the region, causing an economic boom in and around Crosby. I'm concerned that by cutting off access, this will cause great economic harm. Tourism will slow, businesses will close, employment will suffer & property values will plummet. Before the last decade's boom here, a majority of the buildings downtown were boarded up. Drug abuse was rampant, along with alcoholism. I'm afraid that this is what the future of Crosby will be if the recreation area access isn't restored.

On a more personal note, this area that is affected by the closure is where I hike. It's where I kayak when the rest of the accesses in the recreation area are busy. It's where I do a majority of my photography in the area. It's absolutely the reason that I choose to live here.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support

continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Scott Rockvam
Crosby, MN

Monday, April 13, 2026

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Jon and Kristy Davis

15092 Erickson Lane Deerwood MN 56444

Monday, April 13, 2026

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Kristy Davis

Owner - Una Rakki, 131 W. Main St Crosby MN 56441

Amy Zipko

From: george sohnle <gsohnle@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 9:52 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Greetings,

Just wanted to voice my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068. The parcel of land was bought landlocked. This is extremely unethical to try and force the DNR's hand into letting these people get away with something that is not appropriate.

Thank You,
George

George Sohnle

•

Amy Zipko

From: S Athrow <stephanie.athow@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 10:11 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use. I'm new to mountain and gravel biking and I am looking forward to exploring more of this beautiful state through our extensive trail systems. In particular, the Cuyuna area is high on my list to check out this summer, as I've heard it is a particularly nice trail system to explore. I also enjoy hiking and backpacking to explore the state. As an engineer, I understand the importance of science-based review processes to help protect and sustain our public lands for my use and for future generations to come. I urge you to not end route this important review process that our excellent people at the DNR are the most qualified to perform.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Athrow
Bloomington, MN

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee,

I am writing in opposition to HF 4787 and urge the committee to carefully consider the serious precedent it sets for the management of public lands in Minnesota, specifically within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

As co-owner of Cuyuna Outfitters in Crosby, Minnesota, I have a direct and personal stake in this issue. My business depends on the integrity and accessibility of the CCSRA for our customers — local residents, regional visitors, and tourists who come to experience one of Minnesota's premier outdoor recreation destinations. Any legislation that threatens the long-term cohesion of that area threatens not only my livelihood, but the economic vitality of the broader Cuyuna community.

This issue is not simply about one divided interest or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion — it mandates a specific outcome. That is deeply concerning. It bypasses the established role of the DNR to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which have never identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern does not end with this bill. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If legislative action is used to grant access in this instance, it becomes very difficult to deny similar requests in the future. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel will fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive, publicly accessible recreation area — and once that fragmentation begins, it cannot easily be undone.

Our guests come to the Cuyuna area because it offers something rare: a well-managed, connected, and accessible outdoor space. That reputation drives tourism, supports local businesses like mine, and contributes meaningfully to the regional economy. Legislation like HF 4787 puts all of that at risk by undermining the consistent, merit-based process that has protected these lands.

I strongly urge the committee to reject HF 4787 and reaffirm the importance of maintaining a deliberate, transparent review process for any proposals involving state-managed lands. The long-term integrity of the CCSRA — and the communities that depend on it — is too important to be decided through legislative shortcuts.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Sarah Nelson Katzenberger,

Owner, Cuyuna Outfitters Crosby, Minnesota

RE: Formal Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

To the Members of the Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee,

My name is Charles Carlson. I reside in Riverton, MN, bordering the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area (CCSRA). I am writing to express my strong opposition to HF 4787 and its companion, SF 5068.

While I write today as a private citizen, my perspective is informed by a combined 16 years of volunteer leadership within the CCSRA community, including my current role as Vice Chair of the Cuyuna Country Citizen's Advisory Council (CAC).

I wish to bring three critical concerns to your attention:

- **Dangerous Legislative Precedent:** By legislating a specific road easement for a private developer, you are bypassing established DNR protocols and setting a precedent that jeopardizes the integrity of every State Park and Recreation Area in Minnesota. The CCSRA contains several other private or shared-ownership parcels; passing this bill invites a "gold rush" of similar requests for special treatment. This issue is much more complex than you are being led to believe. The best solution would come from a legal agreement, and not legislative action.
- **Economic and Environmental Risk:** The CCSRA is a primary economic driver of our local economy. Its success is built on the "silent sport" criteria established in the CCSRA Master Plan. This legislation lacks the necessary detail and restrictive context to protect the CCSRA, therefore altering its non commercialized, silent sport focus. Furthermore, the developer currently possesses the legal easements necessary for a private residence; they are seeking legislative intervention solely to bypass protections that prohibit commercial development within the CCSRA—protections specifically codified by the Legislature in 1995.
- **Misrepresentation of Local Support:** The developer has characterized a recent CAC resolution as "support" for this project. This is factually incorrect. The CAC voted only to support opening a dialogue between the DNR and the developer; we explicitly stated this was not an endorsement of the project itself.

The DNR's "measured" approach is not a bureaucratic hurdle; it is a vital safeguard for our state's resources. HF 4787 is a premature, overly broad solution to a complex land-use issue that risks undoing decades of successful conservation and economic growth.

I urge you to vote **NO** on HF 4787 and SF 5068.

Sincerely,



Charles Carlson

15944 Bald Eagle Dr, Riverton, MN

Amy Zipko

From: Troy Patrick <TroyPatrick3@proton.me>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 10:23 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written. There is absolutely no support for this from the local communities for this development. Please, I implore you to do what is right for the people of the Cuyuna Lakes region. Our community depends heavily on tourism dollars and allowing our most important resource to be held hostage will break us. Town that have been revitalized by these mountain bike trails, will dry up, people will leave and blight will occur yet again.

As chair of the City of Crosby's Planning and Zoning commission I understand the need to balance everyone's interest, however, in this case, by allowing the land to be blocked, only one person's interests are being met. I would suggest you go one step further and recommend using eminent domain to shut down this request. You secure this land for Minnesotans for generations to come. Don't let one individual rile over the masses.

Additionally, this bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Troy Patrick
Chair, Planning and Zoning commission
City of Crosby, MN
651-329-5772

April 11, 2026

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy,

I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Jessica Hoffmann

Concerned Citizen

Amy Zipko

From: Shannon Conk <shannonjconk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 10:33 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

As someone who travels to, spends money at, and enjoys and cherishes the Cuyuna Country State Rec Area, I am writing to strongly express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Shannon Conk
Minneapolis, MN

Amy Zipko

From: Cpinkdot <cpinkdot@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 10:43 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written. I travel to the Cuyuna often to ride bikes and spend time outdoors. Many people from Sioux Falls love visiting Crosby for this reason. These dollars are important to the state / region because we can't cook. We spend our money locally.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Chad Pickard
605-201-1072

Amy Zipko

From: Jeff Frane <jeffreygfrane@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 11:02 AM
To: Amy Zipko
Subject: Opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

I am a business owner who's viability depends on the successful management of the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area and I have deep concerns about the implications of this bill as written for both the CCSRA and other DNR managed resources.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jeffrey G Frane
Owner Dusty Roads Events LLC
715.379.7940

April 13, 2026

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy,

I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chad Katzenberger

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee,

I am writing regarding HF 4787 and respectfully urge you not to advance the bill as currently written.

This is not a question of being for or against development. As a small business owner who serves on an economic development board and the CCSRA advisory council, I support thoughtful growth and private investment. The concern is the structure of this bill and the precedent it creates.

HF 4787 does not simply resolve a single access request. It establishes a replicable mechanism: a private party with an access dispute can seek a legislatively directed easement across public land, without meeting the standards, conditions, or negotiated outcomes required through the Department of Natural Resources process.

That shift matters.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, there are multiple parcels with undivided ownership interests and similar access constraints. These are not rare conditions. They are part of the landscape. Under the structure of this bill, each of those situations becomes a candidate for the same legislative remedy. The result is not a one-time exception, but a repeatable path.

HF 4787 removes the incentive for either party to reach a balanced, negotiated outcome. Once legislative relief becomes a viable option, the established DNR process is no longer the governing path, it becomes optional. That undermines consistent land management and long-term planning within the recreation area.

This concern is not a defense of how the DNR has handled this dispute. Both parties had engaged in negotiations that included potential public benefit, land use conditions, and the possible transfer of undivided interest to strengthen public access. Those elements are absent here. The issue is not which party prevails, but that the legislative solution removes the structure that protects the public regardless of the outcome.

As written, the bill also leaves the public in a weaker position. It does not restore the public access corridor that existed prior to 2026, and it grants access to one party without ensuring continued access for the public or for other state-owned lands beyond the parcel.

This is not a matter of adjusting terms to make the bill more favorable. Unless legislation explicitly limits its applicability and preserves the requirement for public benefit and negotiated balance, the precedent risk remains.

HF 4787, as written, creates that risk.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Johnna Johnson
Crosby, MN

Chair and members of the committee,

I am writing with regard to HF 4787 regarding granting a private access easement within Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area..

I am Board Secretary for the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area (CCSRA) Citizens Advisory Council, a board established by Minn. Stat. 85.0146 to provide direction on the establishment, planning, development, and operation of the Cuyuna country state recreation area. I also reside in City of Cuyuna moved to the area (purely discretionary as a remote worker) because of the natural amenities established in CCSRA. While I have spent numerous hours studying and meeting publicly on this issue, *I am speaking personally in this testimony.*

I urge you NOT to forward this legislation as it is currently written. If a legislative remedy is pursued, it must at least be amended to include language returning to the pre-2026 status quo of a public access corridor by easement through the undivided interest parcel. The undivided interest parcel in question is within the CCSRA boundaries and included a previously-platted public right-of-way that has provided road and trail access to a significant portion of the park until this property dispute.

Let me first say I am generally supportive of Prinsen's plans, and *I am categorically supportive of private property rights.* I am also very disappointed how DNR has approached the administrative application for this easement and how they have navigated this property dispute.

It appears DNR's position is desiring all land within the CCSRA boundaries to become DNR land – a noble goal – but are attempting to skirt around the cost of that desire. Even today, I am sure there is a dollar figure the state could offer Prinsen/Tretter to abandon their plans and sell the June Lake property and their claim on the undivided interest parcel. Yet they do not. Furthermore, DNR's easement denial letter to Prinsen in December, 2025 was needlessly inflammatory, dismissing the input of CCSRA CAC and devaluing the role of CCSRA in revitalizing the Cuyuna Range as a recreational destination by using a pretext of future mining to justify their position. So, this testimony should by no means be read as support of DNR's position on this dispute to date.

However the bill before you as written would not protect the public interest by preserving public access to other DNR/public parcels in CCSRA as was the status quo prior to 2026 when a public right-of-way was platted through this undivided interest parcel. The benefit of the proposed easement in this bill, through the undivided interest parcel, is only to the June Lake (Prinsen/Tretter) property. However **both the State and Prinsen/Tretter have essentially the same interests in the undivided interest parcel** of which they share ownership. Both parties have land further into CCSRA, behind the undivided interest parcel, only accessible by road/trail *via* the undivided interest parcel. **So it's highly problematic to give an easement to one without an easement to the other.**

I should also note that, while I am not speaking for CCSRA CAC, the position CCSRA CAC took in support of DNR furthering the easement negotiation process with Prinsen/Tretter was predicated upon a significant potential for public benefit that does not exist in the outcome prescribed by this bill. Prinsen/Tretter had previously offered to gift their 1/24 share of the undivided interest parcel to DNR such that the entire parcel would become available for public access and park development. If that had happened, the need for a public access easement would be unnecessary since DNR would fully own the parcel. Additionally, Prinsen invited DNR to impose conditions of approval for an administratively-granted access easement which would ensure that private development on the Prinsen/Tretter June Lake property would happen in alignment with the goals of the CCSRA Master Plan and in alignment with the public interest.

None of those benefits exist in this bill, and the bill leaves the public in a worse position than they were in prior to removal of the previously-platted right-of-way in 2025 and Prinsen/Tretter's requested closure of public road/trail access in 2026. Assuming the right-of-way no longer exists as Prinsen/Tretter claim (which may still be under dispute by DNR), and assuming this bill proceeds forward as written, **Prinsen/Tretter as tenants-in-common with DNR would still be able to prevent public access on the existing road and trail through the undivided interest parcel on the corridors used by the public prior to 2026.**

For this reason, if the Legislature sees fit to pursue a legislative solution to this private access easement request, please amend the language of this bill to preserve a public access easement as well.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

Matt Steele
Cuyuna, MN
952-393-9091
matt@mattsteele.net

Sunday, April 12, 2026

Chair and Members of the Committee

My name is Barbara Grove, and I was part of the leadership that created this after mining left the Cuyuna Range. We were left with holes in the ground and barren land. Communities and families had no money after being abandoned, and thousands of acres became a trash dump. Then a small group, including state and county citizens (including myself as Director of Cuyuna Range Economic Development), came together to develop a vision for the future.

A Joint Powers Board was formed of all the communities surrounding the state-designated land to be a future park. Each community signed a document pledging to preserve and protect those 5,000 acres.

Because we have so many lakes in our area, we wanted to make our park unique and decided to focus on "Silent Sports." We had fishing, diving, slow-powered boating, swimming, and later paddleboarding, kayaking, and canoeing, along with trails for walking and street biking. Later came mountain biking.

Last year we had 400,000 visitors, the second most of any Minnesota State Park. Our communities are thriving.

Over the last 40 years, we have eliminated ATVs from our Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, and we now have 70 miles of bike trails. We are also negotiating to accommodate ATV users without disturbing our bike trails.

Now, I understand that the Donald Trump sycophants now in our state legislature and the tag team of the Heintzeman's have wired in and fast-tracked an easement that will destroy all that we have so carefully and productively built for our recreation area and the entire Cuyuna Range.

1. Those of us who were on the CCSRA Advisory Committee were never informed that there were bills being introduced to hijack our committee.
2. Those bills were designed to eliminate the positions of several persons, including myself, last year.
3. This year's easement bill was in court several years ago, and the judge threw it out. Same property, same easement request. Do we have to go back to court?

Parks throughout the state will have free access to all of the CCSRA and other users, particularly mountain bikers, when their safety is threatened. It will destroy all our 40 years of work and success.

Barb Grove

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

My name is Laura Huisinga, and I am writing to share my concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it may establish for the future management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

Our community benefits greatly from visitors who come to enjoy the trails, lakes, and outdoor experiences that make this area special. Because of that, it is important to protect the public assets that drive that success.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The bill does not provide room for agency review or discretion. It mandates a specific outcome.

That is concerning because the role of the DNR is to evaluate proposals based on environmental impact, long-term land use, public benefit, and consistency with adopted planning frameworks. The Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plans have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

My concern also extends beyond this single request. The recreation area contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this case, it becomes harder to distinguish future requests of a similar kind.

Over time, incremental decisions can reshape public land in ways that are difficult to reverse. Roads, utilities, and access points added parcel by parcel may gradually fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area for public use and recreation.

In addition, it is very concerning that while this dispute continues, there could be real economic consequences for our community. Ongoing conflict and uncertainty may create disruptions to existing recreational access, discourage visitors, and place added strain on the local businesses that depend on tourism. In a community like ours, even temporary closures or interruptions to the experiences people travel here for can have a meaningful ripple effect on our local economy.

This letter is not written in opposition to development. It is written in support of fair process, consistency, and long-term stewardship. I believe proposals involving state land should continue to be evaluated through the established channels created for that purpose.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of HF 4787 and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Laura Huisinga
Crosby, MN Resident

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

I am writing to share concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it establishes for the management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

This issue is not simply about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state land are made, and whether long-standing processes designed to protect those lands will continue to be respected.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. The language does not allow for review or discretion. It requires a specific outcome.

That approach bypasses the established role of the DNR, which is to evaluate environmental impact, long-term land use, and public benefit. It also disregards the framework laid out in the CCSRA Master Plans, which, since their inception, have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

The concern is not limited to this request. The CCSRA contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this instance, it becomes difficult to distinguish this case from future requests of a similar nature.

Over time, incremental decisions like this can change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and access points introduced parcel by parcel can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area.

There is value in maintaining a consistent process. The current system allows proposals to be evaluated on their merits, with consideration given to long-term stewardship and public use. Shifting those decisions into statute removes that balance.

This letter is not a position against development. It is a position in support of process, consistency, and the long-term integrity of public land.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of this bill and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Ben Nelson

Dear Environmental and Natural Resources Finance and Policy Committee Members,

My name is Mason Ruschmeier, and I am a resident of Ironton, Minnesota. I am writing to share my concerns regarding HF 4787 and the precedent it could create for the future management of public lands within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area.

The Cuyuna area is an important part of our community identity and local economy. Residents and visitors alike value the trails, lakes, and outdoor recreation opportunities that make this region unique. Because of that, decisions involving public land should be made carefully and through the proper established process.

This issue is not only about one parcel or one access point. It is about how decisions affecting state-managed land are handled, and whether the systems in place to protect those lands will continue to be followed.

HF 4787 directs the Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state land. Rather than allowing a full agency review, the bill requires a predetermined outcome.

That raises concern because the DNR's role is to evaluate environmental impacts, long-term land use, public benefit, and consistency with adopted planning goals. The Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plans have not identified commercial development within the recreation area as a guiding direction.

My concern also extends beyond this single proposal. The recreation area contains multiple parcels with undivided interests. If access is granted through legislation in this case, it may become difficult to distinguish future requests of a similar kind.

Over time, decisions made one parcel at a time can gradually change how public land functions. Roads, utilities, and new access points can begin to fragment what was intended to remain a cohesive recreation area for public enjoyment.

I respectfully ask the committee to consider the broader implications of HF 4787 and the precedent it may set for future actions involving state-managed lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Mason Ruschmeier
Ironton, Minnesota

The following form letter was submitted – rather than print each one out individually a consolidated list of letter writers is attached.

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 4787 / SF 5068 as currently written.

This bill directs the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to grant a perpetual easement across state-managed land for a private parcel. The language requires the outcome rather than allowing the DNR to exercise its standard review process. In addition, the bill does not explicitly require environmental review or clear alignment with the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area Master Plan.

I am concerned that this approach removes important agency discretion and established review processes that are designed to evaluate long-term land use, public benefit, and resource management. The DNR's role is to ensure decisions about state recreation land are made through a balanced and transparent process that considers broader impacts.

Within the Cuyuna Country State Recreation Area, land ownership patterns include split and undivided parcels. Decisions that grant access through legislative directive rather than standard review may influence how future access requests are considered over time and could have cumulative effects on the management of the recreation area.

I am also concerned about the broader precedent this sets for public land management in Minnesota. This legislation has the ability to impact land use and all silent sports going forward across the state. Public recreation lands depend on consistent, science-based review processes to ensure long-term protection and sustainable use.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that you oppose HF 4787 / SF 5068 as written and support continued DNR-led review and established planning processes for state-managed recreation lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sawyer Anderson, Waite Park, MN
Bennett Goiffon, Golden Valley, MN
Neville Eclov, Mendota Heights, MN
Ann Ewert, St Paul, MN
Mark Pankratz, Bloomington, MN
Corbyn Knotts, Ironton MN
Benji Altman, Minneapolis MN
Julie McGinnis, Red Raven Bike, Crosby,
MN
Kelly Ramsburg, Minneapolis, MN
Jaci Riley, no city listed
SD Garcia, Ironton, MN
Christian Kraemer, Brainerd, MN
Patrick Stoffel, Red Raven Bike, Crosby,
MN
Erica Bibeau, no city listed
Stephanie and Edgar Morales, The
Sanctuary, Crosby, MN
Edgar Morales, Crosby, MN
Stephanie Morales, Crosby, MN
Clayton Schostag, Hugo, MN
Brigette Mastel, Ironton, MN
Ashleigh Voss, Minneapolis, MN
Amy & Randy Stanfield, Deerwood, MN
Melissa Cherry, Minneapolis, MN
Natalie Griffith, Minneapolis, MN
Rochelle Knotts, Ironton, MN
Austin Applequist, Minneapolis, MN
Oliver Toftness, no city listed
Monica Shoberg, Brooklyn Center, MN
Mark Vosacek, Deerwood MN
Matt Kelm, Hovland, MN
Lori Vosacek, Deerwood MN
Rod Wegner, Outing, MN
Will Hoeg, Hawk Family LP, Deer River,
MN
Lynnette Provost, Brainerd, MN
Adam Talajkowski, Minneapolis, MN
Emily Pfremmer, Bloomington, MN
Annie Deutsch, Minneapolis, MN
Marissa Guthrie, Whitewater, WI
Nancy Hartwig, Breezy Point, MN
Anita Hollenhorst, Ironton, MN
Kristin Scherber Patrick, Crosby, MN

Norma Wolk, Minneapolis, MN
Taylor Jessen, Cuyuna, MN
Greg Whiteman, Brainerd, MN
Katie Neshek, Hovland, MN
John Michael Schultz, Crosby, MN
Halley Granec, White Bear Lake, MN
Peter Gustafson, Ardent Bicycles, Grand
Rapids, MN
Brendan Moore, Burnsville, MN
Colleen Sylvester, St Paul, MN
Thea Spranger, Brooklyn Park, MN
David Gabrys, Cuyuna, MN
Eric Van Wyk, Minneapolis, MN
Jessica Granec, White Bear Lake, MN
Derek Erlie, Blaine, MN
Stephanie Johnson, Ironton, MN
Michaela Ahern, St Paul, MN
Elizabeth Salguero, Pequot Lakes, MN/
Omaha, NE
Tyler Thompson, Minneapolis, MN
Shae Rossetti, Ironton, MN
Bryan Hansel, Grand Marais, Minnesota
Jeff Schmiege, Saint Louis Park, MN
Josh Finstad, Crosby, Minnesota
Grant Armour, Minneapolis, MN
Frank & Rachel Lundeen, South Range, WI
Christopher Deutsch, Lakeville, MN
Katie Rasmussen, no city listed
Austin Schachtner, Minneapolis, MN
Britany Schachtner, Minneapolis, MN
Mark Lecy, no city listed
Jenny Jurek, Deerwood / Duluth, MN
Carolyn Stanley, no city listed
Claire Bauer, Brooklyn Center, MN
Lisa LaCore, Cloquet, MN
Amie Burrill, Prior Lake, MN
Laurie Meller, Riverton, MN
Lacey Morgan, Minneapolis, MN
Chelsea Strate, Minneapolis, MN
Corey Eichelberger, Duluth, MN
Wyatt Anderson, Saint Cloud, MN
Josh King, no city listed
Brian Buell, Crosby, MN
Kelly Draehn, Minneapolis, MN

Kristy Crocker, Brainerd, MN
Chad Hartwig, Lake Country Toyota
Kelli Turcotte, Brainerd, MN
Sarah Griffith, Pine River, MN
Caleb Loney, Minneapolis, MN
Caleb Petersen, no city listed
Matthew Runion, Minneapolis, MN
John Powell, Edina, MN
Nathan Roden, Crosslake, MN
Melissa Olsn, Pequot Lakes, MN
Hailey Czech, Brainerd, MN
Joe Roy, Lakeville, MN
Molly Zimmerman, Crosby, MN
Bethany Meister, Minneapolis, MN
Angela Danks, Mankato, MN
Michelle Vaske, no city listed
Jennifer Lust, Brainerd, MN
Valerie Fiksdal, Nisswa, MN
Tina Schmidt, Sartell, MN
Meghan Schwob, Crosby, MN
Casey Burres, Bloomington, MN

Troy Paumen, Crosby, MN
William Sundvor, Madison, WI
Paul Kozitka, Deerwood, MN
Scott Gabriel, La Crosse, WI
Mia Kozitka, Deerwood, MN
Jason Feist, Ironton, MN
Nicole Feist, Ironton, MN
Courtney Johnson, Deerwood, MN
Andrew Loveitt, Deerwood, MN
Brad Nolan, Ironton, MN
Matt Prise, Minneapolis, MN
Courtenay Deane, Deerwood, MN
Jared Wasserzieher, Ironton, MN
Chris Kirschman, Andover, MN
Nick Summers, Orono, MN
McKenzie Wasserzieher, Ironton, MN
Matt Sundquist, Brainerd, MN
Cody Stewart, Aitkin, MN
Alex Schwartz, Crosby, MN
Dylan Lyons, Des Moines, IA
Laura Radniecki, Brainerd, MN